

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 26 are pending in the present application and stand rejected. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 3, 11, 19 and 23. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable and requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Independent Claims 1, 11, 19 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,343,314 issued to Ludwig et al. The Examiner has rejected the dependent claims as either anticipated by Ludwig or obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Ludwig in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,342,906 issued to Kumar.

Ludwig discloses creation of an expert file that is shared with videoconference participants and a separate client profile invoked by a field representative on the expert's screen that is displayed secretly.

Kumar discloses an annotation layer that interprets user input during a discussion mode to move common cursors, create, move or delete markings and text which, "since the annotation layer is transparent, appear over the application," with the applications and data "synchronized among all clients to display the same view."

Claim 1 recites a method comprising in part, "displaying said second file only on said primary workstation as an overlay to said first file, wherein said second file is not viewable by said at least one secondary viewer."

Claim 11 recites a method comprising in part, "accessing a file for said collaboration, said file having a first and second states, in which data stored in said first state is displayed to all of said plurality of remote users, and in which data stored in said second state is displayed only to said host as an overlay to said first state."

Claim 19 recites a system comprising in part, "said first workstation containing programmed instructions to cause the first file to be displayed on both the first workstation and the at least one video display, and to cause the second file to be displayed only on the first workstation as an overlay to said first file."

Claim 25 recites instructions comprising in part, "accessing a second file, said second file comprising annotations to said first file; and displaying said second file only on said primary workstation, wherein said second file is not viewable on said secondary workstation."

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Ludwig nor Kumar anticipates or makes obvious Applicant's claimed invention because neither Ludwig nor Kumar teach, suggest or disclose all elements recited by Claims 1, 11, 19 and 25. For instance, neither Ludwig nor Kumar teach suggest or disclose a method or system having an "overlay" or "annotations" displayed over a first file at a primary workstation and "not viewable" on a secondary workstation. Further, no motivation exists to combine the disclosures of Ludwig and Kumar to suggest such an overlay or annotation layer on a primary workstation that is not viewable on a secondary workstation. For instance, Ludwig fails to disclose any editing of its client profile displayed on the expert or any motivation to display the client profile as an overlay or annotation. Kumar's abstract explicitly teaches away from Applicant's claimed invention by stating "The applications and the data are synchronized among all clients to display the same view." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 11, 19 and 25 are allowable, as are claims 2-10, 12-18, 20-24 and 26 which depend respectively from Claims 1, 11, 19 and 25.


CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent via facsimile to Commissioner for Patents on April 28, 2003.


Attorney for Applicant(s) 28 Apr 2003
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,


Robert W. Holland
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,020